

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 6 has been further amended and claims 16-20 have been added. Claims 1-20 are pending and under consideration.

The Remarks submitted on February 28, 2007 addressed the rejections of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 102(b) and claims 4, 9, and 14 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Those remarks are incorporated herein by reference. The following addresses the further amendment to claim 6 and the patentable distinctions of new claims 16-20.

Claim 6 has been further amended to remove possible ambiguity regarding "a structure of information as previously recited on line 2 and "an information structure" as recited on line 13. Entry of this further amendment is respectfully requested.

New claims 16-20 are supported, for example, in FIG. 3 and the description thereof, found on page 17, line 17 to page 21, line 20. Therefore, no new matter has been added and entry of new claims 16-20 is respectfully requested.

On pages 4-7 of the Office Action mailed September 29, 2006, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by an article by Osawa entitled, "Generation and Evaluation of Glyphs Representing Superclass-subclass relationships", in an IEEE publication published in 2000 that was identified only by the ISBN number 0-7695-0840-5. As discussed in the February 28, 2007 amendment, it has been assumed that the article was published in the Proceedings of the 2000 IEEE International Symposium on Visual Languages. If Osawa continues to be used in rejecting the claims, the Examiner is respectfully requested to confirm this assumption.

Osawa disclosed glyph representations of classes (Abstract, lines 1-3), but is not enabling with respect to any operations of the methods recited in claims 16-20. As stated in section 2121.01 of the MPEP, "[t]he disclosure in the assertedly anticipating reference must provide an enabling disclosure of the desired subject matter, merely naming or description [sic] of the subject matter is insufficient, if it cannot be produced without undue experimentation" (quoting from *Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research*, 346 F.3d 1051, 1054, 68 USPQ2d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2003)). For example, "inference by multivalued logic", recited in claim 16, lines 8-9, was cited in the Office Action as being anticipated by "initiator (starting symbol)" and "generator (rewriting rule)" of Osawa. The generator in Osawa was further described as a triangular shape on page 82, column 1, line 2. Nothing in Osawa has been found that would allow one skilled in the art to construct an "inference by multivalued logic" from a

starting symbol and a triangular shape without undue experimentation. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 16-20 are not anticipated by Osawa.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 

David E. Moore
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501